



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic. By GEORGE WICKER ELDERKIN. Johns Hopkins dissertation. Baltimore: privately printed, 1906, pp. 49.

The author proposes to compare the speech in the later Greek epics, particularly in Quintus of Smyrna, with that in Homer. His claim that this may prove an important chapter of comparative study in Greek epic poetry is well established by his own work. The statistics for Homer had already been worked out by Schneidewin. In the *Iliad* 44 per cent. is speech, in the *Odyssey* 56 per cent.; Mr. Elderkin finds 29 per cent. in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius, 24 per cent. in the *Posthomeric* of Quintus, 12 per cent. in the Orphic *Argonautica* and 36 per cent. in Nonnus. There is also a marked decline in the number of speeches, Homer having one for every 21 verses, Apollonius one for every 41, Quintus one for every 50, Nonnus one for every 70. In length Apollonius and Quintus approximate the Homeric average, 10.57 vv., while Nonnus more than doubles it. The author also works out the percentage of speech in the several books of Apollonius, Quintus, and Nonnus. However, he will find many who will not admit the claim that the highest percentages of speech are coincident with the points of highest dramatic interest. In their reluctance to begin or end a speech within a verse the later writers follow Homer, but in the Homeric practice of introducing speech within speech they almost entirely failed. The subjects of speaker and object addressed are next discussed. We are not surprised to learn that with rare exceptions these are gods and men. The horse of Achilles speaks, so does an eagle in Penelope's dream. A crow speaks in Apollonius, and this fact gives occasion for a lengthy piece of erudition which had better been relegated to the footnotes. In Quintus the speakers are uniformly gods and men. Of more interest is the manner of address. A list of the vocatives in the *Posthomeric* shows that the vocative with ω is more common in Quintus than in Homer, but there is a strict conformity to Homeric regulations in not using ω with names of the gods, and with patronymics. Homer's women do not use ω ; Quintus' do in only three instances. Perhaps this is not due to the masculinity of the speakers, but to familiarity and an assumption of equality with the persons addressed. The principles involved in the use of the vocative with or without the interjection were discovered by John A. Scott *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXIV, pp. 192 ff. and they hold true for Quintus with surprising precision. In the distribution of speeches, as in the *Iliad* Achilles, and in the *Odyssey* Odysseus, have much the larger number, so do Jason in Apollonius and Neoptolemus in Quintus. A radical departure from Homeric usage is seen in the number of speeches assigned to divinities. In the *Iliad* these are 27 per cent. of the whole, in Quintus only 10 per cent. This decline is due perhaps to a slight extent to oratio obliqua

but much more to the reluctance of the later poets to repeat. On the monologue we find several suggestive paragraphs. In the discussion of the dialogue, it is rightly observed that the curtailing of the amount of this, especially dialogue between the gods, has greatly detracted from the Homeric character of the *Posthomericæ*. The work closes with an analysis of the speeches of the *ὄπλων κρίσις*. All in all Dr. Elderkin has done an interesting and able piece of work.

G. W. PASCHAL

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE

Étude sur la Thébàide de Stace. Par LÉON LEGRAS. Paris: 1905. Pp. 356.

The writer of this essay in criticism, on the Theban legends in Greece and in Rome, had prepared himself for it by writing an earlier book entitled *Les légendes thébaines dans l'épopée et la tragédie grecques*. Indeed he frequently refers to his former paper and considers this as a sequel to it. It is not possible in a short review to give an adequate notion of the contents of a book so filled with facts and observations as this. The book falls into two main divisions, the former dealing with the subject and sources of the poem and the latter with its execution. The twenty-six subdivisions or episodes of the *Thebaid* are discussed in detail, and referred to their origin: in general to Homer and the early dramatists, particularly Euripides, or to some of the various collections of mythological fables, or, if the story is Roman, to Virgil. In no case is there any evidence of true poetic invention, but at best an admirable use of the material already gathered. Much the most interesting part of Legras' book is found in the second part, which treats of the poet's literary execution. It is plain that we are dealing with a product of the schools of *grammaticus*, *rhetor*, and *philosophus*. The first furnishes the time-honored subject-matter, the second the methods of arrangement and treatment, and the third Statius' views on man, nature, and the gods. Statius is quite vague in his knowledge of philosophy; his use of it is uncertain and often self-contradictory; he merely repeats what he has learned in the schools, in his reading of Virgil or Lucan. Similar remarks might be made concerning his management of epical ornaments and of his style. He is quite dependent on his predecessors and his innovations are usually not happy ones.

Legras' book is a praiseworthy, sober, and useful work. The author indulges in no excesses of rhetoric. He is lavish neither of praise nor blame, desiring above all to present his readers with actual facts and tangible results.

JOHN M. BURNAM

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI